DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 774 CE 023 387

AUTHOR Lamason, Carolyn Starner
TITLE Male Enrollment in Secondary Home Economics Programs in Pennsylvania Public Schools. Final Report, July 1, 1978, to June 30, 1979.
INSTITUTION Hood Coll., Frederick, Md.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 73p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Cocurricular Activities; Equal Education; *Home Economics Education; *Home Economics Teachers; *Males; Program Descriptions; Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; Student Characteristics; Student Participation; Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to (1) describe male enrollment in secondary home economics programs, (2) compile data on the home economics teachers and departments, and (3) gain insight into factors the school superintendents saw as having the most effect on male enrollment in the public secondary schools in Pennsylvania. Data were collected through mailed questionnaires, which were received from 301 school districts. It was found that the percent of males enrolled in home economics in Pennsylvania (23%) was very close to male enrollment in home economics at the national level. Youth-related activities within the home economics department involved only four percent of the male students. Distribution of teachers by school districts indicated that nearly half of the districts had two teachers per department and every teacher in the study was female. Scheduling and course offerings, the enjoyment of food, peer pressure, personal interest in home economics subject areas, and our changing society were the five most frequent responses to the question pertaining to the one factor the superintendents saw as having the most effect on male enrollment. (Author/LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PA 7813119

DEC 0 6 1979

DEC 1 4 1979

FINAL REPORT

MALE ENROLLMENT IN SECONDARY HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS IN PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROJECT #83-9002

Carolyn Starner Lamason

317 W. Green Street

Shiremanstown, Pennsylvania 17011

Phone: 717-761-1684

Hood College

Frederick, Maryland

~~August~~ July 1, 1978 to June 30, 1979

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABSTRACT

Male Enrollment in Secondary Home Economics Programs in Pennsylvania's Public Schools. Carolyn Starner Lamason, Master's. Hood College, Frederick, Maryland, 1979.

The study was for the purpose of describing male enrollment, compiling data on the home economics teachers and departments, and gaining insight into the factors school superintendents saw as having the most effect on male enrollment in the public secondary schools in Pennsylvania. A questionnaire was developed to identify types of settings in which school districts were located, to describe the extent of male enrollment in various program types, to compile data on the home economics department and on the teachers in those departments and to identify possible factors that affect male enrollment in home economics as seen by school superintendents.

The population for the study was the 505 public school districts in Pennsylvania. Data were collected through mailed questionnaires which were received from 301 districts of the identified population. Data were tabulated and analyzed through electronic data processing methods for frequencies and percentages. Correlation coefficients were compared at the 0.05 and the 0.01 levels.

It was found that the percent of males enrolled in home economics in Pennsylvania was very close to male enrollment in home economics at the national level. Twenty-three percent of the total enrollment in home economics were males. Of the male students enrolled in home economics, 65.4 percent were enrolled in vocational and 34.6 percent were enrolled in non-vocational programs. Male participation in comprehensive programs was 24 percent of the total home economics enrollment as was their participation in specialized programs. Of the males enrolled in specialized home economics programs, 58 percent were enrolled in the area of foods and nutrition.

Sixty-five percent of the schools were located in rural communities and 35 percent were in urban areas. Youth-related activities within the home economics department involved only four percent of the male students. A very limited amount of team teaching of home economics with other subject areas was reported.

Distribution of teachers by school districts indicated that nearly half of the districts had two teachers per department. All of the home economics teachers in the study were females and 70 percent were married. The largest number of teachers were in the age group 25-31 and over 64 percent of the teachers were 41 years of age or younger. Seventy-four percent of the teachers had earned a bachelor's degree. Seventy-three percent of the teachers had less than 16 years of teaching experience.

Scheduling and course offerings, the enjoyment of food, peer pressure, personal interest in home economics subject areas, and our changing society were the five most frequest responses to the question pertaining to the one factor the superintendents saw as having the most effect on male enrollment in home economics. The guidance departments, coeducational classes in early grades, the home economics teacher, and an "easy course" were also listed as having an effect on male enrollment in home economics.

ABSTRACT

Project #83-9002: Male Enrollment In Secondary Home Economics Programs In Pennsylvania Public Schools

Carolyn Starner Lamason
317 W. Green Street
Shiremanstown, Pennsylvania 17011

$895.00 Federal
$ 0.00 Non-Federal
8/1/78 to 6/30/79

The study was for the purpose of describing male enrollment, compiling data on the home economics teachers and departments, and gaining insight into the factors school superintendents saw as having the most effect on male enrollment in the public secondary schools in Pennsylvania.

Objectives

1. To describe the extent of male and female enrollment in home economics programs and youth-related activities.
2. To compare the male enrollment in vocational home economics programs with male enrollment in non-vocational programs.
3. To compare enrollment in the five subject areas of home economics.
4. To compile data on the home economics departments and on the teachers within those departments.
5. To identify possible factors that affect male enrollment in home economics as seen by school superintendents.

Outcomes

Data were collected through a mailed questionnaire which was received from 301 (60%) of the 505 schools in the population of the study.

1. Twenty-three percent of the total enrollment in home economics were males.
2. Sixty-five percent were enrolled in vocational programs and thirty-five percent were enrolled in non-vocational programs.
3. Fifty-eight percent of the males enrolled in specialized programs were enrolled in foods and nutrition.
4. Four percent of the students in youth-related activities within the home economics departments were males.
5. Seventy percent of the teachers were married, sixty-four percent were forty-one years of age or younger, seventy-five percent had earned a bachelors degree and seventy-three percent had less than sixteen years of teaching experience.
6. Superintendents indicated that scheduling and course offerings, the enjoyment of food and peer pressure had the most effect on male enrollment in home economics.

Audience

The resulting report will be of interest to home economics curriculum planners and educators, school administrators and persons interested in sex equity.

Available Materials

Final Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 5

- Interest Areas of Males 5
- School Setting 9
- Delineation of Teachers 11
- Barriers Affecting Enrollment 12
- Enrollment Trends 14
- Summary 16

III. METHOD OF PROCEDURE 18

- Objectives 18
- Description of the Population 18
- Description of the Instrument 19
- Research Procedure 20

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 24

- Enrollment in Home Economics Programs and Related Youth Activities in Communities of Various Sizes . . 24
- Home Economics Enrollment in Various Program Types . . 29
- Home Economics Teacher Information 36
- Factors Affecting Male Enrollment 40

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 43

. . . . . .

LITERATURE CITED 49

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 51

APPENDICES

- A. Letter of Transmittal 52
- B. Questionnaire 53
- C. Post Card Reminders 57
- D. Coding Plan 59

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number and Cumulative Percent of Questionnaires Returned by Given Dates 22

Table 2. Extent of Male and Female Enrollment in Youth Related Activities Within the Home Economics Department 25

Table 3. Number and Percent of Schools by Community Type . . 26

Table 4. Correlation of Community Type by Enrollment Variables 27

Table 5. Extent of Schools by Number and Percent in Rural and Urban Communities by Program Type 28

Table 6. Total Number and Percent of Schools in Rural and Urban Communities by Program Types. 29

Table 7. Distribution of Schools by Home Economics Program Types in Grades Ten Through Twelve 30

Table 8. Extent of Male and Female Enrollment by Vocational and Non-vocational Programs 31

Table 9. Extent of Male Enrollment by Program Type 31

Table 10. Distribution of Enrollment in Comprehensive Programs by Grade Level 32

Table 11. Extent of Participation in Comprehensive Programs by Grade Level 33

Table 12. Distribution of Enrollment by Subject Areas . . . 34

Table 13. Extent of Male and Female Enrollment by Subject Areas 35

Table 14. Extent of Male and Female Enrollment by Comprehensive and Specialized Programs 35

Table 15. Extent of Team Teaching Involving Home Economics Teachers by Cooperating Areas 36

Table 16. Distribution of Schools by the Number of Teachers Per Department 37

Table 17. Distribution of Teachers by Age 38

Table 18. Distribution of Teachers by Number of Years in Teaching 39

Table 19. Distribution of Schools by Grades in Which Home Economics Was Taught 40

Table 20. Distribution of Superintendents by Factors Seen as Having an Effect on Male Enrollment in the Public Secondary Schools in Pennsylvania . . . 42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In society today there is a greater freedom of role choice among family members than ever before. With the freedom of role choice comes the need for home economics to educate both males and females. In spite of the need for consumer and homemaking education, male enrollment in secondary school programs has shown only a slight increase through the years.[19]

Caputo[6] at Iowa State University reported in 1971 that 20 percent of the males in her study were enrolled in home economics in their senior year, and even fewer males were enrolled in earlier years of school. According to a report issued by the Pennsylvania Department of Education in 1975-76, male enrollment of seniors in general home economics was less than 25 percent.[24] In a speech delivered at the American Home Economics Association's 65th Annual Meeting, Kohlman stated that "...in 1971 seven percent of the enrollment in secondary home economics classes throughout the United States had been boys; whereas, in 1973 the figure increased to 10 percent."[17]

Teachers of home economics were challenged in an article entitled "The Changing Mission of Home Economics" written in the late 1960's by McGarth[21] to be aware of the additional responsibility of educating both males and females in an effort to help them meet their rising expectations of a better life. The article stated that there

were 90,000 professional people in home economics, and 55 percent of those people were teachers.

Kohlman, a leader in home economics education for males, has written: "If consideration is given to such determining factors as the masculine self-image, aptitudes, cognitive abilities, and goals of the male, he will not be an intruder in home economics classrooms but an active participant eager to take advantage of the opportunity to acquire greater competency for assuming his present and future roles as an individual and as a family member."[15] Graham at Pennsylvania State University in 1967 similarly concluded from her study that "...the ultimate and optimistic results would be to increase the number of boys who are prepared to lead well-adjusted and useful family lives."[10]

In a 1977 article by Busching,[5] a male home economist, three factors were identified as being important in determining the future of the male in home economics. Those factors included the idea of the "human role" rather than the "sex role," the elimination of sexism, and the initiative within the profession to make it exciting to the male.

Lawson, in an article published in 1977, made several generalizations concerning the degree, nature, and circumstances of males in home economics education. Some of these generalizations included:

1. The nature and degree of participation of males in home economics education has been largely determined by the prevailing social climate.
2. Male participation in home economics at the secondary level has been marginal and has shown only relatively little improvement over time.
3. Home economics programs have continued to reinforce traditional sex-role stereotypes.
4. Home economics teachers have accepted the status quo and have seemed little concerned with the need to change and innovate.
5. The urgency of including males in all facets of home economics has not been apparent to home economics professionals.[19]

Home economics educators might be able to increase male enrollment if they were able to see students as they are today, not as they were yesterday or last year. Inservice-education programs for home economics teachers can be planned to facilitate the strengthening of these programs in order to encourage male participation in the field of home economics. An examination of the present male enrollment in home economics programs in the secondary schools in Pennsylvania can aid in the development of programs and teacher training sessions.

The objectives of this study, therefore, were:

1. To describe the extent of male and female enrollment in home economics programs and home economics-related youth activities in 1978-79.
2. To compare the male enrollment in home economics programs in communities of different sizes.
3. To compare male enrollment in vocational home economics programs with male enrollment in non-vocational programs.
4. To compare male enrollment in comprehensive home economics programs with male enrollment in specialized programs.
5. To compare male enrollment in the five home economics subject areas.
6. To compile data on the home economics departments and on the teachers within those departments in Pennsylvania's Public Secondary Schools.
7. To identify possible factors that affect male enrollment in home economics as seen by school superintendents.

The operational definitions under which this study was made were as follows:

1. Rural - districts located in small towns (less than 10,000 people), open country or farming communities.
2. Urban - districts located in cities and towns (more than 10,000 people) and their suburbs.
3. Vocational programs - those home economics programs, as seen by the respondents, that comply with the Vocational Education

Amendments and are receiving funding for such programs.

4. Gainful vocational home economics - programs, as seen by the respondents, that meet the Vocational Education Amendment guide lines where home economics knowledge and skills can be used for employment.

5. Useful vocational home economics - programs, as seen by the respondents, that meet the Vocational Education Amendment guide lines where home economics knowledge and skills can be used to improve home environment and the quality of family life.

6. Comprehensive home economics - programs where several areas of the discipline is taught.

8. Secondary - grades ten, eleven, and twelve in the public schools in Pennsylvania.

This study was funded through a mini-research grant made available by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A search of the literature was made for factors that might influence enrollment in home economics. The first section of the five part study examined studies that would provide information on areas in home economics that would be of interest to males. Studies involving home economics programs in schools of different community settings were reviewed in addition to studies that would delineate home economics teachers. Barriers that have prevented males from enrolling in home economics programs and have made teaching males more difficult were investigated. The search concluded with the examination of reports and studies of trends in male enrollment in home economics.

Interest Areas of Males

There have been many theories about the interest areas of males who elect home economics. Studies indicated areas within the field of home economics in which males expressed a desire for information. The following suggestions for classes containing male students have evolved from a study by Miller[22] at the University of Oklahoma in 1968. Miller[22] wanted to ascertain why males were not enrolling in a family living course in a regional high school and just how much interest there was in various topics included in family living in order to develop curriculum that would motivate the male student. The sample for the study was drawn from males in grades nine through twelve in a high school in Oklahoma. One hundred fourteen topics were included in the questionnaire

and the males were asked to rank them in order from most interest to least interest with the most interest shown in consumer education.

Miller[22] suggested that classes be made so useful and helpful that male students would recommend the course to their friends. She also suggested that the administrators might consider a name change and the use of male teachers for the sex-education portion of the family living course. It was also suggested that male enrollment might improve if a joint offering with the social studies department was made available.

Moderate interest in the general area of family living was found, and most males preferred a coeducational class if they elected the course. In the area of family living course content, Miller[22] suggested that content not be changed for a class with male students but that activities be changed and the amount of time for a particular topic might be changed depending on student interest. She also stated that male interest might increase if meaningful and relevant topics such as family finance and consumer education were included in their classes.

Miller[22] found that areas of male interest were parallel to those of females with the exception that males were more interested in family finance than females, and males were not interested in nursery school which was a favorite of females. Male interest in nursery school did increase after they became involved.

A study designed to identify homemaking activities being assumed at home by eleventh and twelfth grade males in Iowa schools was accomplished by Brown[3] in 1969. Participants in the study were 250 boys from grades eleven and twelve randomly selected from a modified random sample of twenty-five schools. The participants responded to fifty-nine items

on a questionnaire dealing with foods, clothing, housing and home management, child development and family living by choosing one or more of the following five response categories: I know or do this now; I need help to know or do this now: I will need to know or do this in the future; I will need help to know or do this in the future; This does not apply to me. The male students showed a need for aid in the areas of management and human development. Brown suggested that consideration might be given to placing emphasis in these two areas in a curriculum offering.

At Iowa State University in 1971, Caputo[6] gathered information about successful programs for boys in home economics. Data were collected by a questionnaire that was developed using information obtained from interviews, personal experience and previous studies. Participants in this study consisted of home economics teachers throughout the continental United States who were making a significant contribution in home and family life education for males in senior high schools as recommended by state supervisors of home economics.

The majority of the coeducational classes in Caputo's[6] study were providing instruction in the subject area of human development and the family. Almost all of the courses provided for males were offered on an elective basis. Two-fifths were offered for a full year, and one half were offered for a semester. Subject matter areas reported to be of interest to males were problems of purchasing, building and equipping a home, social customs, personal appearance, clothing selection and food principles.

In 1969 research was done by Buck[4] on the opinions of Iowa high school principals, homemaking teachers, and parents concerning course

offerings for males in home economics. Scores on the degree of interest in the five subject areas in home economics were obtained by means of a questionnaire. Using the average mean score of all items in the five subject areas from each respondent group, the ranking by area from highest to lowest was as follows for principals and teachers: (1) human development and the family, (2) housing, (3) home management and family economics, (4) foods and nutrition, and (5) textiles and clothing. For parents the order was: (1) human development and the family, (2) housing, (3) foods and nutrition, (4) home management and family economics, and (5) textiles and clothing.

Dowell and Greenwood[8] in The Masculine Focus in Home Economics have written: "Rather than trying to fit the male students into our traditional courses, it would seem more helpful to determine the roles the students will be filling and possible related problems involved and then determine what home economics has to offer in helping with this role preparation." Male students might help to determine those roles and as a result increase interest in home economics.

Kohlman[16] suggested that teaching techniques might also increase interest. In Home Economics for Young Men: A Teaching Guide Kohlman[16] wrote: "In many instances it is not what is taught as much as how it is taught that makes the difference." With the blurring of sex roles, interest areas of females can also be appropriate for males. Kohlman[16] stated that "...characteristics of male students are believed to be the key to motivating him and making instruction meaningful and effective." The characteristics of males are "...ambitious, adventurous, independent, self confident and shrewd" and these can be capitalized on by providing educational experiences that will help him improve his self-image.

School Setting

In 1972 and 1973 Johnson[12] and Jolly[13] investigated interest areas of males in home economics in Central Texas. Johnson's[12] sample was drawn from metropolitan schools and Jolly's[13] was drawn from rural schools. Both used an instrument for data collection developed by Akkerman[1] of Texas Woman's University in 1970. The questionnaire was administered to 50 boys enrolled in home economics and 50 boys who were not enrolled in a home economics program.

In the comparison study by Jolly[13] similar student interests were noted in the two types of schools. Responses from the students in the two settings were the same in the areas of outdoor cooking, budgeting the clothing dollar, family financial planning, factors that make a happy marriage, checking and savings accounts. Little interest was shown by the students for selection and use of table service, clothing construction, furniture arrangement, and selection of floor coverings and window treatment in either the rural or the metropolitan schools.

Students in rural schools were not interested in the influence of heredity upon individuals and federal legislation of consumer credit. State laws that regulate consumer credit, the family life cycle, and the aging process were least liked by the metropolitan students in that Central Texas study.

Yamaguchi[27] in 1970 studied a rural population of post high school males in Iowa. Relationships were studied between clusters of assumed roles and the respondent's ages, number of years married, number of children, educational level completed, place of residence, and employment status of their wives. The clusters were formed for the

purpose of studying relationships. Size of correlation coefficients, logical relationships in terms of content and duplication of items across clusters were the considerations used to form the clusters.

The information obtained was used to make recommendations for curriculum in home and family life. The recommendations included emphasis on factors that effect a happy marriage and family financial planning. Yamaguchi[27] suggested a similar study be done in an urban area so results could be compared and assumptions made on differences and similarities between curriculum for males in rural and urban school settings.

Hall and Paolucci[11] in Teaching Home Economics described some characteristics of rural and urban schools. Schools in rural settings generally have a low enrollment and provide a common meeting place for both school and community activities. There is not much teacher involvement in school activities due to the long drive to school. Teachers are expected to be innovative and at the same time support basic fundamentals and traditions. Urban schools have a greater number of students and usually do not serve as a center for community activities. Opportunities for teachers are unlimited. Diverse backgrounds and values have made it difficult in urban schools to stabilize old and establish new patterns.

With more of the population shifting to an urban setting home economics teachers will need to be aware of the uniqueness of the students enrolling in their classes. In the book Toward Better Teaching of Home Econimics Fleck[9] indicated a need for home economics teachers to pay special attention to intercity students due to a prediction that 70 to 75 percent of the total population will be living in cities of 50,000

or more by the early 1980's. She indicated a need to develop curriculum and to prepare teachers for an increase in male and female enrollment in urban school settings where one out of every two children enrolled belongs to a disadvantaged group.

Delineation of Teachers

Little has been written on the personal and professional background characteristics of home economists who teach males in the secondary schools. Caputo[6] indicated that four-fifths of the teachers in her study were married and one half were under forty years of age. The median number of years teaching experience for the respondents was eight years.

In 1968 at Texas Technological College, Allen[2] studied teachers who were involved in family life courses in high schools in different regions of the United States. The teachers were asked to respond to a questionnaire pertaining to selected background variables such as age, sex, years of teaching and marital status, general areas of instruction, and the encouragement of values in family life courses.

The results of Allen's[2] study indicated almost equal emphasis on all areas of family life education by the more experienced home economics teacher. The inexperienced teacher taught only a few of the areas in family life education. Teachers in the age range of 45 and over tended to place the most emphasis on values and skills in family life courses, followed by those from 22 to 30 with those from 30 to 45 last. The data also indicated the more personal experience in family life, the more detailed was the teacher's course content.

A strong indication was found in the data from Allen's[2] study that the course content may vary according to the teacher's educational

background. The data indicated that teachers with a bachelor's degree plus additional hours in the area of family life placed more emphasis on all areas of family life education than did those with just a bachelor's degree in home economics.

Barriers Affecting Enrollment

Buck[4] made an effort to identify barriers that prevented males from experiencing the freedom of enrolling in home economics classes. In her study parents, teachers, and administrators indicated their responses to various questions pertaining to beliefs concerning barriers that might have prevented the enrollment of males in courses for home and family living. Data were collected for this study in 1969 from randomly selected high schools in Iowa by means of a two part questionnaire. Part I surveyed the beliefs regarding the role of the male in the young family today; Part II surveyed beliefs concerning barriers that might prevent the enrollment of males in courses for home and family living provided by home economics.

It was indicated that college preparatory males did not have time to fit home economics into their schedules. More than half of the respondents agreed that female teachers were a barrier to male enrollment. All respondents agreed that tradition dictates that males do not need to be experts in the field of home and family living to be considered acceptable members of society.

Administrators, teachers and parents all indicated that courses were not promoted to attract the male, that vocational opportunities related to home economics were not understood, and that students were not introduced to the field of home economics at the junior high or middle school level. Buck[4] suggested that these barriers could be overcome by

improving the offerings, not only in content but also in the method of teaching, and that much of the hesitancy on the part of the males to enroll would then be overcome.

Lack of resource materials without sex stereotyping for subject areas other than foods was cited in a study by Montag[23] as a reason for not teaching all areas of home economics to boys. Respondents in her study in Oregon schools in 1970 indicated a need for emphasis on bachelorhood rather than on marriage, and also the need for teaching awareness of changing roles of men and women.

Further indication of the importance of instructional aids and methods were presented in Caputo's[6] study. In her study group discussion was the only one of ten suggested teaching methods that was indicated by over one half of the respondents as being successful. Problem-solving assignments were identified as being especially enjoyable to male students. Teachers indicated that males were very competitive in the home economics classroom and that spirit of competition should be used for motivation purposes. Instructional aids and methods should be designed with male students in mind.

Dowell and Greenwood[8] summarized some of the more common barriers to male enrollment in home economics in The Masculine Focus in Home Economics. Barriers cited were community environments with varying attitudes regarding sex roles, parental attitudes with very often a limited perception of home economics and a stereotyped image of male and female roles, peer attitudes that strongly influence adolescent behavior, attitudes of school personnel with their misunderstanding and misinterpretation of what home economics has to offer males, and home economics teachers who had never considered the possibility of teaching males.

In 1965 Kreutz[18] at Teachers College, New York questioned 579 home economics teachers who had taught males. Trouble spots that teachers should be aware of when working with males were identified. Some of these trouble spots reported by older and more experienced teachers included:

1. Working with young men who had little interest in school.
2. Meeting the differences in background preparation of young men.
3. Incorporating the differences in interests and developmental levels of young men.

Kreutz[18] also found that younger teachers with fewer years of teaching experience reported more difficulties in the areas of:

1. Selecting content and methods for classes in which young men were enrolled.
2. Discipline.
3. Getting depth in subject matter to interest young men.

There are many reasons why more males are not enrolled in home economics. Dowell and Greenwood[8] have concluded that some degree of variation exists as to the specific barriers operating in a given situation. Every student, teacher, and community setting is unique. This creates a difference in the degree of influence each barrier will have on a particular situation.

Enrollment Trends

The potential of home economics education for strengthening the quality of family life has been the most consistent rationale for offering courses in home economics to males in public schools according to Lawson.[19] In his historical review of United States males in secondary home economics, he indicated an increase over the years in male participation in home economics and stated that in 1977 "...the degree of participation by boys is at an all-time high and showing a positive trend."[19]

According to King,[14] Education Program Specialist for the United States Office of Education, male enrollment in useful home economics programs has increased on the national level from four percent of the total enrollment in 1966 to 28 percent in 1977. In the state of Pennsylvania[24] in 1975-76 and 1977-78, male participation averaged 20 percent of the total enrollment. The figures both on the national level and the state level represent vocational home economics programs and reflect the enrollment as accurately as possible under the data collection systems which were used.

Male enrollment does not appear to be equally distributed throughout all home economics subject areas. The area of foods and nutrition attracted the largest number of male students. In 1977 the Maryland Home Economics Association[20] conducted a study to determine the scope of home economics courses being taught and to identify some factors relating to the teaching of these courses. One teacher in every school was asked to complete a form on the content of courses taught in the home economics department and approximately half or 500 teachers participated. It was reported that in the state of Maryland 22 percent of the students in foods and nutrition were males.

In the state of Pennsylvania, as indicated by statistical data collected in 1976 by the Department of Education,[24] 33 percent of the students in foods and nutrition programs were males. In the states of Maryland and Pennsylvania nine percent and three percent, respectively, of all students enrolled in clothing courses were males and nine percent and two percent were enrolled in child development courses. Data available from the state of Maryland[20] for family life and housing indicated that male enrollment constituted seven percent and five percent,

respectively, of the total enrollment. No figures were available for Pennsylvania in these areas.

Title IX[26] has legislated to all persons, regardless of sex, the benefits of education programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1976[25] stated that federal funds could be used by consumer and homemaking programs but that these programs "...must encourage participation of both males and females to prepare for combining the roles of wage earner and homemaker." The present social climate has made the area of home economics more inviting to males.

Summary

This search has focused on interest areas of males in home economics, community settings of schools included in male enrollment studies, research that would characterize the teacher of male students, factors that might affect male enrollment, and male enrollment trends in home economics. Most of the research dealt with subject interests of the male students and the development of curriculum to meet those interests.

The studies on male enrollment have for the most part concentrated in the Central and Western parts of the United States. Enrollment figures are available on the national level and in the state of Pennsylvania for only those students enrolled in vocational home economics programs. Due to the lack of data available for non-vocational programs, a clear picture of male enrollment in all secondary schools was not available.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to collect data on male enrollment in home economics in the public secondary schools in

Pennsylvania. Both vocational and non-vocational, comprehensive and general programs into which males had enrolled were investigated along with the enrollment in the specialized subject areas.

An effort was made to report the figures on male enrollment in the area of home economics in the state of Pennsylvania. Non-vocational programs were of prime concern because there were no figures available for the state of Pennsylvania in that area.

In addition to the literature reported in this paper, interest areas of males have been studied in 1976 by Sinclair at Oklahoma State, Wright at The University of Wisconsin and Tucker at Florida State University. A survey of programs in home economics for males was completed at The University of Southern Mississippi in 1975 by Collins. The findings of these researchers might be included in future studies.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Objectives

The objectives of this study evolved from a need for base line data on male enrollment in the field of home economics in the secondary public schools in Pennsylvania. It was discovered that there was very little information available in Pennsylvania on enrollment trends of males in home economics, on the home economics teachers, or on the programs available in home economics.

The objectives, therefore, were:

1. To describe the extent of male and female enrollment in home economics programs and home economics-related youth activities in 1978-79 in Pennsylvania's Public Secondary Schools.
2. To compare the male enrollment in home economics programs in communities of different sizes.
3. To compare male enrollment in vocational home economics programs with male enrollment in non-vocational programs.
4. To compare male enrollment in comprehensive home economics programs with male enrollment in specialized programs.
5. To compare male enrollment in the five home economics subject areas.
6. To compile data on the home economics departments and on the teachers within those departments in Pennsylvania's Public Secondary Schools.
7. To identify possible factors that affect male enrollment in home economics as seen by school superintendents.

Description of Population

The population for the study was the 505 public school districts

in Pennsylvania as of January 1978. At the request of the State Program Specialist, Home Economics Education, there was no sample drawn. It was suggested that absolute numbers would allow the findings to be more useable by those involved with home economics curriculum planning and development at the state level.

The instrument was mailed to the superintendents in each school district, and they were asked to respond. In the state of Pennsylvania, school districts vary greatly in size. School communities are located in settings from inner city to farm and mountain areas. This study, therefore, reflects findings from all types of schools from inner city to rural.

A pilot study was carried out in eight parochial schools in Pennsylvania for the purpose of checking the procedure, checking the instrument and acquiring knowledge that might improve the project. Replies were received from seven of the eight schools which were asked to participate in the pilot study.

Description of Instrument

Data were gathered by means of a mailed questionnaire designed by the researcher. Ideas for the questions and format for the instrument came from a study at Iowa State in 1970 by Caputo[6] and Pennsylvania's Vocational Education Management Information System forms.

The instrument was in the form of a booklet and consisted of a cover-page and three parts. The cover-page expressed the purpose of the study through a letter of transmittal and requested the support of each school district. Districts desiring a copy of the findings were given an opportunity to make that request.

Part one asked for information about the school district.

Intermediate Unit number, county, community size, and secondary school enrollment figures were requested.

Part two was comprised of questions pertaining to home economics programs. This section consisted of check lists on grades in which home economics was taught and types of programs available. Questions were asked pertaining to youth activity programs, F.H.A. Chapters, and interdisciplinary team teaching. Male-female enrollment figures were requested for program, courses, and youth activities. An open-ended question appeared in this section related to the one factor the superintendent saw as having the most effect on male enrollment in home economics.

Part three requested birthdate, marital status, sex, number of years in teaching, and highest degree attained for each home economics teacher for grades ten, eleven, and twelve. There was a separate section for including data on each secondary home economics teacher in the district.

Research Procedure

The design of this study was descriptive in that an effort was made to describe male enrollment in home economics programs in the public secondary schools in Pennsylvania. It was concerned with the number of males enrolled and with the types of programs and courses in which they were enrolled, the types of community settings in which the schools were located, selected data on the secondary home economics teacher, and the one factor the superintendents saw as having the greatest effect on male enrollment in home economics.

Questionnaires were mailed to the superintendents in the 505 public school districts in Pennsylvania in January 1979, with the request that they respond and return it within ten days. Two weeks after

the original mailing, a double post card was sent to those superintendents who failed to return the questionnaire. The portion of the post card they returned asked the superintendents to indicate which statement best fit their position on the return of the questionnaire:

1. I have already mailed the questionnaire.
2. Today I am getting it in the mail.
3. I will plan to complete the questionnaire in the next two days and mail it to you.
4. Something happened to my questionnaire. Please send another, and I will complete it.

After another two weeks had passed, a single post card was mailed to the superintendents who had failed to respond, reminding them of the importance of their response to the success of the project.

A total of 301 (60%) of the questionnaires were returned by the March 22, 1979 cut-off date. Of those returned, 285 were useable, eight were returned blank, and eight were incomplete.

Many of the superintendents indicated on the double post card that they had not received the questionnaire and requested another one which was promptly sent to them. Several wrote letters after the second post card-reminder stating that they had not received either the original mailing or the double post card and asked to be included in the study. Questionnaires were promptly mailed to those individuals. See Table 1.

TABLE 1

NUMBER AND CUMULATIVE PERCENT OF QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED BY GIVEN DATES

Date Received	Number	Cumulative Percent
Number received before double post card - 2/8/79	205	41
Number received before second post card - 2/21/79	51	51
Number received after second post card - 3/22/79	45	60
TOTAL	301	60

When the questionnaires were returned, they were checked and coded, and totals were made on some of the enrollment figures. The data were punched on computer cards in preparation for analysis. Control cards were also punched for use with the Carleton College Version, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences[7] hereafter referred to as SPSS/C. The question relating to total school enrollment was omitted from the analysis due to incomplete responses on 33 percent of the returned questionnaires. Male and female enrollment in grades ten, eleven, and twelve was requested in the section on district information. It was interpreted by some as if the question had asked for male and female enrollment in home economics as was later requested in the home economics section. The elimination of this question made any correlation between enrollment in home economics and total secondary enrollment impossible.

The SPSS/C[7] was used for computer analysis of the data. Frequencies were computed and presented as one-way frequency distribution tables. Correlations between community type and program enrollment figures were computed. With 285 schools participating in the study, the correlation coefficient necessary at the 0.05 and 0.01 significance

levels were 0.12 and 0.16, respectively.

A summary of the results of this study were mailed to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational Education and to those schools who requested copies. Of the 301 school districts responding to the questionnaire 16 (15%) indicated a desire for a summary of the questionnaire results.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study were divided into four major sections based on the objectives of the research. First, the enrollment in home economics by community size and the extent of enrollment in programs and clubs within the home economics department were presented. The second part involved vocational and non-vocational programs, general programs, specialized programs and comprehensive programs, and the degree of participation in those various program types. Part three consisted of information pertaining to the number of teachers in each home economics department, grades in which home economics was taught within the districts, the extent to which home economics teachers were involved in team teaching in areas outside of the field, and information on the teachers' age, sex, marital status, years in teaching and educational degree. The final section was devoted to factors the superintendents saw as having the most effect on male enrollment in home economics.

Enrollment in Home Economics Programs and Related Youth Activities In Communities of Various Sizes

Total enrollment of males and females in all types of home economics programs in the schools responding to the questionnaire was 47,696 students. Of that total 11,013 or 23.1 percent were males and 36,683 or 76.9 percent were females. The percentage of males enrolled in home economics in the public secondary schools in Pennsylvania was a little less than the national figure of 28 percent in 1977.

Of the 285 schools participating in the study, 88 (30.9%) had Future Homemakers of America Chapters, and 57 (20%) had some other type of youth-related activity within the home economics department. A total of 4,301 students, 162 (4%) males and 4,139 (96%) females, participated in home economics youth-related activities. Other information pertaining to youth-related activities is given in Table 2.

TABLE 2

EXTENT OF MALE AND FEMALE ENROLLMENT IN YOUTH-RELATED ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE HOME ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT

Type of Activity	Males		Females		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
F.H.A. Chapter	61	2.0	2,454	98.0	2,515
Others	101	5.6	1,685	94.3	1,786
TOTAL	172		4,139		4,301

Sixty-five percent of the schools in the study were located in communities of less than 10,000 people or in open countryside, 27.7 percent were located in suburbs of large or medium size cities, and 7.5 percent were located in large or medium size cities. Table 3 presents the number of schools in each of the several community types.

TABLE 3

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SCHOOLS BY COMMUNITY TYPE

Community Type	Number	Percent
Philadelphia or Pittsburgh	1	0.4
Large city (100,000 to 500,000 people)	1	0.4
Medium size city (10,000 to 100,000 people)	19	6.7
Suburb of Philadelphia or Pittsburgh	46	16.1
Suburb of large city	6	2.1
Suburb of medium city	27	9.5
Small town (less than 10,000 people)	110	38.6
Open country or farming	75	26.3
TOTAL	285	

The comparison of male enrollment in home economics programs in communities of various sizes was one of the objectives of the study. Table 4 exhibits correlations of community types with total male enrollment, total female enrollment, total male and female enrollment in comprehensive programs, and total male enrollment in useful and occupational vocational programs and general programs. When the data were coded, larger communities were assigned smaller numbers which resulted in the negative signs.

TABLE 4

CORRELATIONS OF COMMUNITY TYPE BY ENROLLMENT VARIABLES

Variable	Community Type
Total number of females enrolled in home economics	-29[a]
Total number of males enrolled in home economics	-23
Total number of females in comprehensive programs	-10
Total number of males in comprehensive programs	- 1
Total number of males in useful vocational programs	-13
Total number of males in occupational vocational programs	8
Total number of males in general home economics programs	-14

[a] r = 0.12 significant at 0.05 level; 0.16 significant at 0.01 level.

In the areas of total female enrollment and total male enrollment in home economics, there were correlations significantly different from zero at the 0.05 and 0.01 levels. The correlations of total female enrollment with community type was -0.29, while the correlation of the total male enrollment with community type was -0.23. From this one might conclude that in this study schools in small town and rural communities had significantly fewer males and females enrolled in home economics than did schools in larger communities.

The community size had significant correlation at the 0.05 level of -0.13 with male enrollment in vocational useful programs and -0.14 with male enrollment in general home economics. There was no significant

relationship between the number of males or females enrolled in comprehensive home economics programs or the number of males in vocational occupational programs and schools in different size communities.

Program types offered in rural and urban schools were also examined. Rural schools were schools located in communities of less than 10,000 people or open farm land. Urban schools were schools located in communities with more than 10,000 people. Comprehensive programs, specialized programs, and a combination of both comprehensive and specialized programs were offered in both community settings. See Table 5. Of the 285 schools in the study, 103 (36%) offered only a comprehensive program. Eighty-seven (31%) of these schools were in rural settings and 16 (6%) were urban. A specialized program was offered by 100 (35%) schools. Of those offering the specialized program, 48 (16%) were rural and 52 (18%) were urban. A combination of comprehensive and specialized programs were offered by 82 (28%) schools of which 51 (18%) were rural and 31 (11%) were urban. See table 5.

TABLE 5

EXTENT OF SCHOOLS BY NUMBER AND PERCENT IN RURAL AND URBAN COMMUNITIES BY PROGRAM TYPES

Program Type	Rural		Urban		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Comprehensive	87	31	16	6	103
Specialized	48	16	52	18	100
Combination Comprehensive and Specialized	51	18	31	11	82
TOTAL	186		99		

Table 6 indicates the number and percent of rural and urban communities offering the various program types. Of the total 103 schools offering the comprehensive program, 84 percent were in rural communities. The 100 schools offering specialized programs were more evenly distributed with 52 percent located in urban communities. The rural schools more often offered both a comprehensive and a specialized course. A total of 82 schools offered both program types, and of this total 62 percent were in rural communities.

TABLE 6

TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SCHOOLS IN RURAL AND URBAN COMMUNITIES BY PROGRAM TYPES

Program Type	Rural		Urban		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Comprehensive	87	84	16	16	103
Specialized	48	48	52	52	100
Combination Comprehensive and Specialized	51	62	31	38	82
TOTAL	186	65	99	35	285

In summary, of the responding schools 65 percent were from rural settings and male students represented 23 percent of the total enrollment in home economics and four percent of the total number of students involved in youth-related activities within the home economics departments. Both a specialized and a comprehensive program were offered by 28 percent of the responding schools. Thirty-five percent offered specialized programs, and 36 percent offered comprehensive programs.

Home Economics Enrollment in Various Program Types

Various program types or combinations of several program types were denoted by the respondents as shown in Table 7. Useful vocational

programs were reported by 43.9 percent of the schools. Another 29.8 percent indicated a combination of useful vocational and general programs.

The following figures represent the total number of schools which offered programs in the general, useful vocational, and occupational vocational categories. General home economics programs were reported by 146 (51%) of the schools. Two hundred and twenty-three (78%) had useful vocational programs and 14 (5%) had occupational vocational programs.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS BY HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAM TYPES IN GRADES TEN THROUGH TWELVE

Program Type	Number of Schools	Percent
General	48	16.8
Useful Vocational	125	43.9
Occupational-vocational	0	0.0
Useful Vocational and Occupational-vocational	13	4.6
Useful Vocational and General	85	29.8
Occupational-vocational and General	1	0.4
Useful Vocational, Occupational-vocational, and General	13	4.6

A general, non-vocational program was the only program offered by 16.8 percent of the schools. Occupational-vocational programs in combination with useful vocational or general programs were reported by 9.6 percent of the participating schools.

Total enrollment in home economics in this study was 47,696 students. See Table 8. Of this total 31,049 (65%) were in vocational programs and 16,647 (35%) were in non-vocational programs. As shown in

Table 9, 62.5 percent of the males enrolled in home economics were enrolled in useful vocational programs, 2.8 percent were enrolled in occupational-vocational programs, and 34.6 percent were enrolled in non-vocational programs. Participation of male students in vocational programs is approximately 65 percent greater than in non-vocational programs. The large number of schools offering vocational programs could account, in part, for the greater extent of participation.

TABLE 8

EXTENT OF MALE AND FEMALE ENROLLMENT BY VOCATIONAL AND NON-VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program	Males		Females		Males/Females Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Vocational	7,195	23.0	23,854	76.0	31,049
Non-vocational	3,818	22.9	12,829	77.1	16,647
TOTAL	11,013		36,683		47,696

TABLE 9

EXTENT OF MALE ENROLLMENT BY PROGRAM TYPE

Program	Males	
	Number	Percent
Vocational Useful	6,888	62.5
Vocational-occupational	307	2.8
General (Non-vocational)	3,818	34.6
TOTAL	11,013	

Enrollment in comprehensive home economics programs where all areas of home economics were taught totaled 16,148 students, 3,885 (24%) males and 12,263 (75.9%) females. Table 10 shows the distribution of

enrollment, both males and females, by grade level in comprehensive programs.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF ENROLLMENT IN COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS BY GRADE LEVEL

Grade	Males		Females		Males/Females Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
10th	1,117	21.0	4,202	79.0	5,319
11th	955	20.8	3,622	79.2	4,577
12th	1,813	29.0	4,439	71.0	6,252
TOTAL	3,885	24.0	12,263	75.9	16,148

Of the total male enrollment in comprehensive programs, 46.6 percent were enrolled in twelfth grade, 28.7 percent in tenth grade, and 24.6 percent in eleventh grade. Nearly half of the male enrollment was concentrated in twelfth grade; whereas, the female enrollment was more equally distributed among grades ten, eleven, and twelve. The pattern of participation in comprehensive home economics programs as shown in Table 10 and Table 11 was the same for both males and females, with the greatest degree of participation at the twelfth grade level, the next greatest at the tenth grade level, and the least amount of participation at the eleventh grade level.

TABLE 11

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS BY GRADE LEVEL

Grade	Males		Females	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
10th	1,117	28.7	4,202	34.0
11th	955	24.6	3,622	30.0
12th	1,813	46.6	4,439	36.0
TOTAL	3,885		12,263	

Student enrollment in specialized programs where just one area of home economics was taught totaled 48,939. Of the total number of students enrolled in specialized programs, 11,790 (24.1%) were males and 37,149 (75.9%) were females. That total represents students who may have been enrolled in more than one specialized program in a school year.

Enrollment distribution by subject areas can be seen in Table 12. The area of foods and nutrition had the highest number of students, 18,132 (37%) enrolled, followed by child development, 7,373 (15%), clothing and textiles, 7,016 (14.3%), family living, 6,204 (12.6%), housing and home furnishings, 4,254 (8.6%), and consumer education, 2,574 (5.2%).

Two subject areas that respondents added to the list were singles living with 2,019 (4.1%) students enrolled and crafts and needlework with 1,366 (2.7%) students enrolled.

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF ENROLLMENT BY SUBJECT AREAS

Subject Matter Area	Males		Females		Males/Females Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Foods and Nutrition	6,883	38.0	11,249	62.0	18,132
Family Living	1,798	29.0	4,406	71.0	6,204
Child Development	981	13.0	6,393	87.0	7,374
Consumer Education	738	28.6	1,836	71.3	2,574
Clothing and Textiles	496	7.1	6,520	92.9	7,016
Singles Living	457	22.6	1,562	77.4	2,019
Housing and Home Furnishings	400	9.4	3,854	90.6	4,254
Crafts and Needlework	37	2.7	1,329	97.3	1,366
TOTAL	11,790		37,149		48,939

The area of foods and nutrition accounted for 58 percent of the total number of males in specialized programs and 30 percent of the total number of females in specialized programs. The second highest number of males in specialized programs was in the area of family living with 1,798 (15.2%). If this total was combined with the male singles living enrollment of 457 (3.9%), the total specialized family living area would have been 2,255 (19%) students. The extent of male and female enrollment in other specialized areas can be seen in Table 13.

TABLE 13

EXTENT OF MALE AND FEMALE ENROLLMENT BY SUBJECT AREAS

Specialized Program	Males		Females	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Foods and Nutrition	6,883	58.4	11,249	30.0
Family Living	1,798	15.2	4,406	12.0
Child Development	981	8.3	6,393	17.0
Housing and Home Furnishings	400	3.4	3,854	10.0
Consumer Education	738	6.2	1,836	4.9
Clothing and Textiles	496	4.2	6,520	18.0
Crafts and Needlework	37	0.3	1,329	4.0
Singles Living	457	3.9	1,562	4.0
TOTAL	11,790		37,149	

Enrollment figures, both male and female, in comprehensive and specialized programs indicate the same percent of students in both of those program types. Twenty-four percent of the total enrollment in comprehensive and specialized programs were males, and 75.9 percent were females as indicated in Table 14.

TABLE 14

EXTENT OF MALE AND FEMALE ENROLLMENT BY COMPREHENSIVE AND SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS

Program Type	Males		Females		Males/Females
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total
Comprehensive	3,885	24.0	12,263	75.9	16,148
Specialized	11,790	24.1	37,149	75.9	48,939
TOTAL	15,675		53,297		65,087

Home Economics Teacher Information

The investigation revealed a very limited amount of team teaching among home economics teachers and teachers in other subject areas. Twenty-eight (10%) of the schools indicated that the home economics teachers were involved with team teaching, twelve did not indicate the subject areas involved. As shown in Table 15, team teaching with business and foreign language was the most frequently mentioned with four schools indicating each of the two subject matter areas. School district superintendents were asked to respond to the questionnaire and their lack of awareness of team teaching could account for the low level of response to that area.

TABLE 15

EXTENT OF TEAM TEACHING INVOLVING HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS BY COOPERATING AREAS

Areas	Number of Schools	Percent
None	257	90.0
Business	4	1.4
Foreign Language	4	1.4
Art	2	0.7
Consumer Education	2	0.7
Industrial Arts	2	0.7
History	1	0.4
Science	1	0.4
Not Specified	12	4.0

Six hundred and eleven teachers were employed in the 285 responding school districts. Distribution by school district indicated

that 48.8 percent of the districts had two teachers per department, 26 percent had one teacher per department and 16.1 percent had three teachers per department. As shown in Table 16, fewer than 10 percent had four through seven teachers per department.

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS BY THE NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER DEPARTMENT

Number of Teachers per Department	Number of Schools	Percent
1	74	26.0
2	139	48.8
3	46	16.1
4	14	4.9
5	8	2.8
6	3	1.0
7	1	0.4

A composite picture of the average home economics teacher in the study revealed a female, twenty-five to thirty-one years of age, married, a B.S. degree, with one to five years of teaching experience. All of the teachers were females. Seventy percent were married, 24.8 percent were single, and 5.1 percent were divorced or widowed.

Table 17 presents the distribution of teachers by age range. The range from 25 to 31 years included 185 (30.2%) of the teachers, and the range from 32 to 41 years included 127 (20.8%) of the teachers. Over 64 percent of the teachers were 41 years of age or younger.

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY AGE

Age Range	Number of Teachers	Percent
24 or Younger	84	13.2
25 - 31	185	30.2
32 - 41	127	20.8
42 - 51	104	17.0
52 - 61	103	16.9
62 and older	8	1.3
TOTAL	611	

Nearly three-quarters (74%) of the teachers had earned a bachelor's degree, and the remainder had earned a master's degree. The low percent of master's degrees could have been due in part to the lack of availability of institutions offering advanced degrees in home economics and to the large number of young teachers.

Seventy-three percent of the teachers had less than 16 years of teaching experience, and nearly half of those with less than 16 years had fewer than five years of teaching experience. Table 18 indicates the distribution of teachers by the number of years in teaching.

TABLE 18

DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHERS BY NUMBER OF YEARS IN TEACHING

Range in Years	Number of Teachers	Percent
1 - 5	212	34.6
6 - 10	150	24.5
11 - 15	85	13.9
16 - 20	76	12.4
21 - 25	46	7.5
26 - 30	28	4.6
31 - 35	11	1.8
36 and up	3	0.5

In the public schools in Pennsylvania home economics was taught 98.1 percent of the time from the upper elementary grades through twelfth grade. A meager 1.1 percent of the schools indicated a program under the fifth grade level. Home economics was most frequently taught in grades seven through twelve as presented in Table 19, with 67 percent of the schools indicating this traditional grade span.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS BY GRADES IN WHICH HOME ECONOMICS WAS TAUGHT

Grades	Number of Schools	Percent
K through 12	3	1.1
5 through 12	10	3.5
6 through 12	61	21.4
7 through 12	191	67.0
8 through 12	15	5.3
9 through 12	1	0.4
10 through 12	3	1.1
11 through 12	1	0.4

Factors Affecting Male Enrollment

Each superintendent was asked to write the one factor seen as having the most effect on male enrollment in the public secondary schools in Pennsylvania. Of the 285 superintendents who participated in the study, 32 (11%) did not respond to that one item. The tabulations represented the 253 respondents.

Table 20 presents the factors, ranked by the author, seen as having an effect on male enrollment in home economics and the distribution of superintendents who indicated those factors. Scheduling and course offerings were most frequently listed. Scheduling had a negative effect on male enrollment because it was difficult for males to fit home economics into their schedules while course offerings had a positive effect. Students liked the varied course offerings as listed by the home economics departments. This factor was listed by almost 19 percent

of the superintendents as was the enjoyment of food.

The enjoyment of food preparation and eating was also very high on the list as having a positive effect on male enrollment. As indicated in the list of specialized course offerings, nearly 60 percent of the males in home economics were in the area of foods and nutrition at the secondary level.

Peer pressure has a negative effect on males with 15.8 percent of the superintendents listing it as a factor affecting enrollment. Personal interest and the desire to acquire knowledge in the area of home economics was noted by 14.2 percent of the superintendents as having an effect on the enrollment of males.

Societal changes were mentioned by 13 percent of the superintendents as having a possible effect on male enrollment in home economics. With the increase in the number of females working outside of the home and the increase in the divorce rate and single-parent families, it is becoming more acceptable for males to become involved with household responsibilities.

The guidance departments, public relations, coeducational classes in early grades, home economics teachers, and an "easy course" were also listed as factors affecting male enrollment as can be seen in Table 20.

TABLE 20

DISTRIBUTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS BY FACTORS SEEN AS HAVING AN EFFECT ON MALE ENROLLMENT IN THE PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Factors	Number	Percent
Scheduling and Course Offerings	48	18.9
Enjoy Eating	47	18.6
Peer Pressure	40	15.8
Personal Interest	36	14.2
Societal Change	33	13.0
Guidance Department and Public Relations	19	7.5
Coeducational Classes in Early Grades	16	6.3
Home Economics Teacher	10	4.0
Easy Course	4	1.6
No Response	32	12.6

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In society today there is a greater freedom of role choice among family members than ever before. With this freedom of role choice comes the need to educate both males and females in the field of home economics. The research presented in this study was for the purpose of describing the extent of male enrollment in home economics in the public secondary schools in Pennsylvania, delineating the home economics teachers, and gaining insight into the factors school superintendents saw as having the most effect on male enrollment.

The objectives of this study were:

1. To describe the extent of male and female enrollment in home economics programs and home economics-related youth activities in 1978-79 in Pennsylvania's Public Secondary Schools.
2. To compare the male enrollment in home economics programs in communities of different sizes.
3. To compare male enrollment in vocational home economics programs with male enrollment in non-vocational programs.
4. To compare male enrollment in comprehensive home economics programs with male enrollment in specialized programs.
5. To compare male enrollment in the five home economics subject areas.
6. To compile data on the home economics departments and on the teachers within those departments in Pennsylvania's Public Secondary Schools.
7. To identify possible factors that affect male enrollment in home economics as seen by school superintendents.

In the 285 schools responding to the questionnaire, there were a

total of 47,696 students enrolled in home economics in the secondary grades. Of that total 11,013 (23.1%) were males and 36,683 (76.9%) were females. The percent of males enrolled in home economics in Pennsylvania was very close to male enrollment in home economics at the national level.

Youth-related activities within the home economics department involved a total of 4,301 students, 162 (4%) males and 4,139 (96%) females. Future Homemakers of America Chapters were reported by 30.9 percent of the responding schools and other youth related activities within the home economics department were reported by 20 percent of the schools.

Sixty-five percent of the schools in the study were located in rural communities (less than 10,000 people or in open-country side). Thirty-five percent were in urban areas (suburbs of cities or in cities).

Sixty-five percent of the total number of students enrolled in home economics were enrolled in vocational programs, and 35 percent were in non-vocational programs. Of the male students enrolled in home economics, 65.4 percent were enrolled in vocational programs and 34.6 percent were enrolled in non-vocational programs.

Male participation in comprehensive programs was 24 percent of the total as was their participation in specialized programs. Nearly half of the male enrollment in comprehensive programs was concentrated in the twelfth grade where 46.6 percent were enrolled. Tenth grade was next highest with 28.7 percent of the enrollment, followed by eleventh grade with 24.6 percent. The female enrollment figures showed a more even distribution among grades than the male enrollment figures.

Of the 11,790 males enrolled in specialized home economics

programs, 58 percent were enrolled in the area of foods and nutrition. That total represents students who may have been enrolled in more than one specialized program in a school year. Family living accounts for the next highest enrollment at 15.2 percent, followed by child development at 8.3 percent, consumer education at 6.2 percent, clothing and textiles at 4.2 percent, housing and home furnishings at 3.4 percent, singles living at 3.9 percent, and crafts and needlework at 0.3 percent.

A very limited amount of team teaching of home economics with other subject areas was reported. Ten percent of the schools indicated that their home economics teachers were participating in team-teaching, but nearly half did not indicate the subject areas involved. Business and foreign language were the most frequently mentioned areas.

Six hundred and eleven teachers were employed in the 285 responding school districts. Distribution by school districts indicated that 48.8 percent of the districts had two teachers per department, 26 percent had one teacher per department, 16.1 percent had three teachers per department, and fewer than 10 percent had four through seven teachers per department.

All of the home economics teachers in the study were females. Seventy percent were married, 24.8 percent were single, and 5.1 percent were divorced or widowed. The largest number of teachers were in the age group 25-31. The range from 32-41 years of age was next largest. Over 64 percent of the teachers were 41 years of age or younger.

Nearly three-quarters of the teachers had earned a bachelor's degree, and the remainder had earned master's degrees in home economics. Seventy-three percent of the teachers had less than 16 years of teaching experience, and nearly half of those had fewer than five years of

teaching experience.

Scheduling and course offerings, the enjoyment of food, peer pressure, personal interest in home economics subject areas, and our changing society were the five most frequent responses by the superintendents to the question pertaining to the one factor they saw as having the most effect on male enrollment in home economics. The guidance departments, coeducational classes in early grades, the home economics teacher, and an "easy course" were also listed with fewer than 10 percent of the superintendents indicating each of those items as having a major effect on male enrollment in home economics.

Several recommendations and suggestions might be made based on the findings of this study. Youth related activities within the home economics department might be made more appealing to the male students. Perhaps activities involving the preparation of snacks for the athlete or the repair or making of toys for children might be of interest. Male enrollment in the home economics program may increase if male students were attracted to the youth related activities within the home economics department.

Inservice programs could be planned to aid teachers in developing curriculum, planning activities, and selecting materials suitable for teaching male students in coeducational classrooms. Emphasis might be placed on specialized subject areas where enrollment is low, such as: consumer education, housing and home furnishings, and clothing and textiles.

Team teaching could be encouraged through professional home economics organizations and inservice training programs. It is the opinion of the author that we must allow our expertise to be known among

the other subject areas within the secondary schools if we are going to meet the challenge of educating both males and females in today's society.

In Pennsylvania's secondary schools the home economics teachers are generally young with relatively few years of teaching experience and are located in schools where there is a 25 percent chance that she will be the only teacher. Support and encouragement from experienced teachers are not always available. These facts suggest the need for a strong support system from the Pennsylvania Department of Education, from the degree granting institutions, and from the home economics professional organizations for the teachers in schools.

Home economics professional organizations might encourage and aid teachers in planning for local public relation campaigns and on-going public relation activities for students, parents, counselors, and administrators to develop an awareness of the importance of home economics for both males and females.

Further research on the factors superintendents saw as having the most effect on home economics may reveal more specific information. This study identified just one factor as seen by each superintendent. A rank order study would be helpful on those factors identified. Factors, as seen by home economics teachers, would also be helpful to the study of male enrollment in home economics.

With the knowledge of where the male students are presently enrolled in home economics in the state of Pennsylvania and with facts about the home economics department and the teachers within those departments, programs can be planned to meet the needs of the male students. The findings of this study will facilitate educators and those responsible

for program planning and development in the area of home economics to meet the challenge of providing relevant and meaningful programs for male students in home economics.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Akkerman, Carol. "Interest Area Courses in Home Economics for Students Not Majoring in Home Economics." Masters thesis, Texas Woman's University, 1970.

2. Allen, Alice A. "An Investigation of Family Relations Courses Taught in High Schools in the United States." Masters thesis, The Texas Technological College, 1968.

3. Brown, Laura Jane. "Perception of Help Needed in Accomplishing Present and Anticipated Homemaking Activities Held by Eleventh and Twelfth Grade Boys in Iowa." Masters thesis, Iowa State University, 1969.

4. Buck, Ruth Ann Westley. "Beliefs of Iowa High School Principals, Homemaking Teachers, and Parents Concerning Offerings for Boys in Home Economics." Masters thesis, Iowa State University, 1969.

5. Busching, Howard C. "Men the Future, and Home Economics." Illinois Teacher, May/June, 1977, pp. 208-209.

6. Caputo, Colleen Diane Cluff. "Contributing Factors to Successful Program Offerings for Boys in Home and Family Life." Masters thesis, Iowa State University, 1971.

7. Carleton College Version. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Graham Kimble, Project Director. February 28, 1978.

8. Dowell, Judy H., and Greenwood, Bonnie B. The Masculine Focus in Home Economics. Home Economics Education Association of the National Education Association, 1975, p. 17.

9. Fleck, Henrietta. Toward Better Teaching of Home Economics. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.

10. Graham, Gladys. "Family Life Education for Boys in Junior High Schools." Masters thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1967, p. 54.

11. Hall, Olive A., and Paolucci, Beatrice. Teaching Home Economics. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.

12. Johnson, Margaret Ann. "A Comparison of Homemaking Interest Areas of Boys Enrolled in a High School Homemaking Program with Boys not Enrolled in the Homemaking Program." Masters thesis, Texas Woman's University, 1972.

13. Jolly, Eva Nell Carter. "Interest Areas of Boys Enrolled in Home Economics Classes in Selected Small Schools." Masters thesis, Texas Woman's University, 1973.

14. King, Bertha. Education Program Specialist, United States Office of Education. Telephone interview, April 12, 1979.

15. Kohlman, Eleanor L. "Helping Young Men Prepare for Changing Roles." Illinois Teacher, May/June, 1975, pp. 273-75.

16. Kohlman, Eleanor L. Home Economics for Young Men: A Teaching Guide. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1975, pp. XII-XIV.

17. Kohlman, Eleanor L. "Teaching Techniques to Interest Boys in Nutrition." Speech delivered at American Home Economics Association's 65th Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, California, (June 26, 1974) p. 1. (Zerox.)

18. Kreutz, Shirley M. "Teacher-Recognized Problems in Teaching Boys in Home Economics." PHD Dissertation, Teacher College, New York, 1966. Ann Harbor, Michigan: University Microfilm, No. 65-14971.

19. Lawson, Royston J. "Tigers Among the Roses: A Historical Review of Home Economics for Secondary School Boys in the United States." Illinois Teacher, May/June, 1977, pp. 216, 222-23.

20. Maryland Home Economics Association. "Report of the Professional Section for Elementary, Secondary, Adult Education." April, 1978.

21. McGarth, Earl J. "The Changing Mission of Home Economics." Journal of Home Economics, February, 1968, pp. 85-92.

22. Miller, Ramah Driskill. "A Research Project to Develop Curriculum for a Family Living Course Attractive to High School Boys." Masters thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1968.

23. Montag, Virginia Lee. "Development of a Unit for Teaching Boys Family Life Education." Masters thesis, Oregon State University, 1971.

24. Pennsylvania Department of Education. "Statistical Data Collected." Harrisburg, 1976. (mimeographed)

25. U.S. Congress, House Education Ammendments of 1976, Pub. Law 94-482, 94th Congress, 1976, H.R. 12835.

26. U.S. Congress, Title IX of the Education Ammendments Act of 1972, Pub. Law 92-318, 92nd Congress, 1972, H.R. 7248.

27. Yamaguchi, Ann M. "Home and Family Roles Assumed by Young Iowa Men." Masters thesis, Iowa State University, 1970.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses deep gratitude to Dr. Joanne Pearson for her guidance and encouragement throughout this research. Special thanks are given to Dr. Donna Cowan and Mrs. Catherine Graf, who served as committee members and who gave helpful suggestions to the researcher.

The research reported herein was performed with the aid of a mini-grant made available by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational Education. Appreciation is extended to Ms. Carolyn Kratz, Home Economics Senior Program Specialist for the state of Pennsylvania, for her help and assistance and to the administrators of the Mechanicsburg Area School District for their support through the administering of the grant.

Genuine thanks go to Ms. Pat Ropp for her assistance in the computer analysis of data. Gratitude is expressed to Mrs. Verna Patton for her assistance in the typing of the manuscript.

Acknowledgement is given Mr. Roger Miller, Librarian, Messiah College, for his assistance in the search of the literature. Appreciation is extended to the superintendents who cooperated in the collection of data.

The writer also expresses thanks to her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lester G. Starner, to her daughter Lora and to other family members who have given reassurance and endless support. Thanks are extended to my colleagues and to Jere, my special friend, for understanding, concern, and inspiration.

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOOD COLLEGE / FREDERICK, MARYLAND 21701

HOOD

(301) 663-3131

52

January 17, 1979

Dear Sir:

The following questionnaire concerned with male enrollment in home economics programs in the public schools in Pennsylvania is part of a state-wide study being conducted with the aid of a vocational education research grant and Hood College. This project is concerned specifically with comparing male enrollment in various types of home economics programs and home economics subject matter areas. The results of this study can give direction to policies and programs in vocational and general home economics, and pre-service and in-service programs can be planned to facilitate the strengthening of these programs.

We are particularly desirous of obtaining your responses because an accurate picture of male enrollment in home economics is needed to better prepare male students for assuming present and future roles as an individual and as a family member. The following questionnaire has been tested and revised in order to make it possible for us to obtain all necessary data while requiring a minimum of your time.

It will be appreciated if you will complete the questionnaire prior to January 31, 1979, and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. I shall appreciate any consideration that you can give to assisting with this important project. If you desire, we will be pleased to send you a summary of questionnaire results. Thank you for your co-operation.

Sincerely yours,

Donna L. Cowan

Donna L. Cowan, Ph.D.
Chairperson
Home Economics Department

Carolyn S. Lamason

Carolyn S. Lamason
Project Director

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECONDARY HOME ECONOMICS QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: DISTRICT INFORMATION

PLEASE INDICATE THE ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS IN THE BLANKS PROVIDED.

1. Which of the following numbers best describes the type of community in which your school is located? Please check the appropriate blank.

   _____ In Philadelphia or Pittsburgh

   _____ Inside a large city (100,000 to 500,000 people)

   _____ Inside a medium size city (10,000 to 100,000 people)

   _____ In a suburb of Philadelphia or Pittsburgh

   _____ In a suburb of a large city

   _____ In a suburb of a medium size city

   _____ In a small town (less than 10,000 people)

   _____ In the open country or in a farming community

2. In what county is your school located? _____

3. What is the name of the Intermediate Unit serving your school?

   _____

4. Indicate the student enrollment in the following grades.

Tenth grade	_____Female	_____Male
Eleventh grade	_____Female	_____Male
Twelfth grade	_____Female	_____Male

PART II: HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAM INFORMATION

1. Indicate the number that best describes the grades in which home economics is presently being taught in your district. Please check the appropriate blank.

_____ K through 12

_____ 7 through 12

_____ 6 through 12

_____ Other, specify_____

2. Indicate the type(s) of home economics programs available to students in grades 10 through 12 by checking the appropriate blank.

_____ General

_____ Vocational, useful

_____ Vocational, occupational

_____ Vocational, useful and vocational occupational

_____ Vocational, useful and general

_____ Vocational, occupational and general

_____ Vocational, useful and vocational, occupational and general

3. Indicate the number of students in grades 10 through 12 enrolled in the following program(s). Include both semesters.

Vocational, useful	_____Female	_____Male
Vocational, occupational	_____Female	_____Male
General	_____Female	_____Male

Realizing that some programs offer courses that include several areas of home economics (COMPREHENSIVE) and others that offer just one area of home economics (SPECIALIZED), please complete the following section.

4. Indicate the number of students enrolled in COMPREHENSIVE courses. Include both semesters.

10th grade	_____Female	_____Male
11th grade	_____Female	_____Male
12th grade	_____Female	_____Male

5. Indicate the number of students in grades 10 through 12 enrolled in the following SPECIALIZED courses. Include both semesters.

Foods and nutrition	_____Female	_____Male
Family living	_____Female	_____Male
Child development	_____Female	_____Male
Housing and home furnishings	_____Female	_____Male
Consumer education	_____Female	_____Male
Clothing and textiles	_____Female	_____Male
Others, specify_____	_____Female	_____Male

6. Is there a Future Homemakers of America Chapter for grades 10 through 12? Please check.

_____Yes _____No

If yes, please indicate the number of students.

_____Female _____Male

7. Is there a club or activity program in grades 10 through 12, during the school day, within the home economics department? Please check.

_____Yes _____No

If yes, please indicate the number of students.

_____Female _____Male

8. Areas within the discipline of home economics such as family life, consumer education and nutrition are interdisciplinary. Is there any team teaching of these areas or other areas within the field of home economics taking place in your school? Please check.

_____No _____Yes, specify_____

9. What one factor do you see as having the most effect on male enrollment in home economics in your school?_____

_____

PART III: HOME ECONOMICS TEACHER INFORMATION

Please complete for every home economics teacher in grades 10 through 12. Your answers are confidential and will be used only in group tabulation. Please indicate each teacher separately.

---

1. Birth date:

_____1954 or later	_____1947 - 1938	_____1927 - 1918
_____1955 - 1948	_____1937 - 1928	_____1917 or earlier

2. Marital status:

_____Single	_____Married	_____Other

3. Teacher's sex:

_____Female	_____Male

4. Total number of years in teaching:

_____ 1 - 5	_____16 - 20	_____31 - 35
_____ 6 - 10	_____21 - 25	_____36 and over
_____11 - 15	_____26 - 30	

5. Highest degree completed:

_____Bachelor	_____Master	_____Doctor

---

1. Birth date:

_____1954 or later	_____1947 - 1938	_____1927 - 1918
_____1955 - 1948	_____1937 - 1928	_____1917 or earlier

2. Marital status:

_____Single	_____Married	_____Other

3. Teacher's sex:

_____Female	_____Male

4. Total number of years in teaching:

_____ 1 - 5	_____16 - 20	_____31 - 35
_____ 6 - 10	_____21 - 25	_____36 and over
_____11 - 15	_____26 - 30	

5. Highest degree completed:

_____Bachelor	_____Master	_____Doctor

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP POST CARDS

POST CARD REMINDERS

Double Post Card Mailed For First Reminder

Dear Sir:

Have you mailed your questionnaire related to "Male Enrollment in Home Economics in Pennsylvania Secondary Schools"? Your response is needed in order to validate the results of this research project.

Because it is important that your reactions are included in the study, please complete the attached card indicating when your response can be expected.

Carolyn Lamason
Project Director

_____I have already mailed the questionnaire.

_____Today I am getting it in the mail.

_____I will plan to complete the questionnaire in the next two days and mail it to you.

_____Something happened to my questionnaire. Please send another and I will complete it.

Name_____.

Address_____

_____

Single Post Card Mailed for Second Reminder

Have you returned your questionnaire related to "Male Enrollment in Home Economics Programs in Pennsylvania Public Schools"? Your response is needed in order to validate the results of this research project.

Because it is most important that your response is included in the study, please return your questionnaire immediately. If something happened to your questionnaire, please let me know and another will be sent.

Carolyn Lamason
Project Director
317 W. Green Street
Shiremanstown, PA 17011

APPENDIX D

CODING PLAN

CODING PLAN

Column	Code	Variable Description and Location
1- 3	Actual number	School district code number
4	1	Card number 1
5	1 Philadelphia or Pittsburgh 2 10,000 to 500,000 3 10,000 to 100,000 4 Suburb of Philadelphia or Pittsburgh 5 Suburb of large city 6 Suburb of medium size city 7 Less than 10,000 8 Open Country	Community type Page 2 Question 1
6- 7	01-67 County list	County number Page 2 Question 2
8- 9	01-29 Intermediate Unit	Intermediate Unit number Page 2 Question 3
10-12	Actual number 10th grade female	Student enrollment by grade Total enrollment Page 2 Question 4
13-15	Actual number 10th grade male	
16-18	Actual number 11th grade female	
19-21	Actual number 11th grade male	
22-24	Actual number 12th grade female	
25-27	Actual number 12th grade male	
28-30	Actual number total female	
31-33	Actual number total male	
34	1 K through 12 2 7 through 12 3 6 through 12 4 10 through 12 5 11 through 12 6 9 through 12 7 8 through 12 8 5 through 12 9 6 through 9	Grades in which home economics was taught Page 3 Question 1

Column	Code	Variable Description and Location
35	1 General 2 Vocational, useful 3 Vocational, occupational 4 Vocational, useful and vocational, occupational 5 Vocational, useful and general 6 Vocational, occupational and general 7 Vocational, useful, vocational occupational, and general	Type of home economics programs offered Page 3 Question 2
36-38	Actual number vocational, useful female	Number of students enrolled in various program types Page 3 Question 3
39-41	Actual number vocational, useful male	
42-44	Actual number vocational, occupational female	
45-47	Actual number vocational, occupational male	
48-50	Actual number general female	
51-53	Actual number general male	
54-56	Actual number total female	
57-59	Actual number total male	
60-62	Actual number 10th grade female	Number of students enrolled in comprehensive home economics programs Page 3 Question 4
63-65	Actual number 10th grade male	
66-68	Actual number 11th grade female	
69-71	Actual number 11th grade male	
72-74	Actual number 12th grade female	
75-77	Actual number 12th grade male	
78-80	Actual number total female	
1- 3	Actual number	School district code
4	2	Card number 2
5- 7	Actual number total male	Number of students enrolled in comprehensive home economics programs Page 3 Question 4
8-10	Actual number foods and nutrition female	Number of students enrolled in specialized courses Page 4 Question 5
11-13	Actual number foods and nutrition male	
14-16	Actual number family living female	
17-19	Actual number family living male	

Column	Code	Variable Description and Location
20-22	Actual number child development female	
23-25	Actual number child development male	
26-28	Actual number housing and home furnishings female	
29-31	Actual number housing and home furnishings male	
32-34	Actual number consumer education female	
35-37	Actual number consumer education male	
38-40	Actual number clothing and textiles female	
41-43	Actual number clothing and textiles male	
44-46	Actual number bachelor living female	
47-49	Actual number bachelor living male	
50-52	Actual number crafts female	
53-55	Actual number crafts male	
56	1 Yes 2 No	Number of F.H.A. Chapters Page 4 Question 6
57-59	Actual number F.H.A. female	Number of students in F.H.A. Chapters Page 4 Question 6
60-62	Actual number F.H.A. male	
63	1 Yes 2 No	Youth related activity in home economics department Page 4 Question 7
64-66	Actual number youth related activity female	Number of students in youth related activities in home economics department Page 4 Question 7
67-69	Actual number youth related activity male	
70	1 Yes 2 No	Interdisciplinary teaching of home economics Page 4 Question 8

Column		Code	Variable Description and Location
71	1	Child development	Subjects involved in interdisciplinary teaching
	2	Industrial arts	Page 4
	3	Business	Question 8
	4	Foreign language	
	5	Social Studies	
	6	Art	
	7	Consumer Education	
	8	Science	
72	1		Factors seen as affecting male enrollment in home economics
	2		Page 4
	3		Question 9
	4		
	5		
	6		
	7		
	8		
	9		
73	1	1954 or later	Teacher birthdate
	2	1955 - 1948	Page 5
	3	1947 - 1938	Question 1
	4	1937 - 1928	
	5	1927 - 1918	
	6	1917 or earlier	
74	1	Single	Teacher marital status
	2	Married	Page 5
	3	Other	Question 2
75	1	Female	Teacher sex
	2	Male	Page 5
			Question 3
76	1	1 to 5	Number of years in teaching
	2	6 to 10	Page 5
	3	11 to 15	Question 4
	4	16 to 20	
	5	21 to 25	
	6	26 to 30	
	7	31 to 35	
	8	36 and over	
77	1	Bachelor's	Teacher's highest degree
	2	Master's	Page 5
	3	Doctorate	Question 5

The last six columns were repeated for each teacher reported by the school districts.